



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,262	12/22/2000	Christer Goransson	027650-907	4978
21839	7590	07/31/2003		<i>8</i>
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER	
			YEUNG, GEORGE CHAN PUI	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1761		
DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/674,262	Goransson et al
Examiner George Young	Group Art Unit 1761

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1 - 7 are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1 - 7 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5 Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

1. The phrase "liquid food products" recited in claim 1, line 2, should be changed to read -- a liquid food product -- in order to be consistent with "the product" throughout the claim.
2. The phrase "of the type" recited in claim 1, line 2, is superfluous and it should be deleted.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention for the following reasons:

1. There is no antecedent basis for "the insufficiently treated product" recited in claim 1, line 3.
2. There is no antecedent basis for "the pressure difference" recited in claim 1, line 4.
3. It is not clear whether the phrase "the treated product" recited in claim 1, line 5, refers to the insufficiently treated product or the sufficiently treated product.
4. There is no antecedent basis for "the downstream side" and "the space" recited in claim 1, line 6.
5. There is no antecedent basis for "the product conduit" recited in claim 3 (lines 2-3) and claim 6 (lines 3-4).

6. There is also no antecedent basis for "the regenerative section" recited in claim 4, lines 2-3.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hup et al (European patent 0554961A1). Hup et al disclose a method for heat treating a liquid food product. The method includes a control unit for measuring the pressure difference between the incoming cold food product and the outgoing hot food product. When the prescribed pressure difference cannot be kept, the liquid food product is enclosed. This is done by closing a product pump and changing a multi way valve to short-circuit the product coming from the pasteurizer (see column 6, line 56-column 7, line 25).

Claims 3-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Lidman et al patent is cited to show a method for heat treating milk the flow of which varies. The Arph et al patent is cited to show a method for continuous sterilization of a liquid milk based product.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Yeung whose telephone number is (703) 308-3848. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:30 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (703) 308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

G. C. Yeung/mn
July 30, 2003


GEORGE C. YEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER